

REVIVAL OF NISSOLIA MICROPTERA (LEGUMINOSAE)

Velva E. Rudd

In the course of searching for types of Machaerium spp., many of which had originally been assigned to the genus Nissolia, I found, in Paris, material of one species that should have been retained in Nissolia, N. microptera Poir. Bentham transferred the species to Machaerium in June 1837, but with the notation that it was unknown to him and its affinities uncertain. In making this transfer he essentially followed DeCandolle (Prod. 2: 258. 1825), who had seen a specimen in the herbarium of Desfontaines and had placed N. microptera Poir. in Nissolia section Machaerium (Pers.) DC. In March 1837, however, Vogel (Linnaea 11: 178. 1837) in commenting on DeCandolle's treatment had expressed the opinion that N. microptera Poir. belonged not to Machaerium but to Nissolia.

Comparison of type specimens of N. microptera Poir., collected by Ledru in the Botanical Garden at Tenerife, Canary Islands, and of N. hirsuta DC., collected by Née (or Sessé & Mociño ?) in Mexico, shows the two species to be synonymous. The correct name, therefore, for this rather common Mexican legume would seem to be Nissolia microptera Poir. with synonymy and citations as follows:

NISSOLIA MICROPTERA Poir. in Lam. Encyc. Meth. Suppl. 4: 98. 1816.

Lectotype at P ex Herb. Poiret.

Nissolia hirsuta DC. Prod. 2: 257. 1825. Holotype at G.

Machaerium micropterum (Poir.) Benth. Comm. Leg. Gen. 37.

1837; Ann. Wien. Mus. 2: 101. 1838.

Nissolia confertiflora S. Wats. Proc. Am. Acad. 21: 424. 1886.

Holotype at GH.

Nissolia multiflora Rose, Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 5: 161. 1889

in part (see op. cit. 32: 192. 1956). Holotype at US.

The holotype of Nissolia hirsuta raises an interesting problem as to its collector. DeCandolle noted, "in Mexico propè Guanajuato detexit cl. Née." According to Cavanilles Née did visit Guanajuato (Icones 4: 71. 1797 [1798]). The label on the specimen, however, bearing the legend "Nissolia N. E. De Guanajuato" resembles those of the Sessé and Mociño collections distributed by Pavón. That there is reason to question the citation of the collector is strengthened by the existence of several specimens that appear to be duplicates of the holotype, but that almost certainly were collected by Sessé and Mociño. Perhaps DeCandolle absent-mindedly misread as Née the handwritten abbreviation for Nueva España, "N. E." ? Or might Pavón have distributed some of Née's Mexican collections, in addition to those of Sessé and Mociño ?